M1779
Tuesday, February 7, 1970
Barn

Mr. Nyland: So Tuesday. Time to Work, time to talk about Work, anyhow: the difficulty of trying to make attempts while you listen. We know all about it. And many times you must really not make an attempt. It's far better to try to keep the thread of a thought and have it deposited in you so that afterwards you can remember it. When this is done with full intensity, there is already something else that will take place in you. It is not Work or a result like Work, but it gives you a certain state of balance which is very useful whenever anyone wants to Work.

I listened to Monday, last night. I don't know if some of you have been there. I saw of the names on the attendance list. You must realize that that particular group has a very definite purpose. It's not that I object to people from Warwick to go there, but also you must know that gradually I'm changing the nomenclature of groups a little bit, or rather the numerology, the numbers of them. That reminds me of one thing for those who are interested—interested in numerology. We started the 1700 series around my birthday. This particular meeting is 1779. So there, you might say, is my lifetime. I would recommend any one of the tapes of the 1700 series. I think in all of them, there is not only more than enough material, but there is always

a reminder of Work, the nature of Work, and the necessity of it. One more word about that. When I talk at the present time, since the beginning of the year, the meaning that I would like to have in meetings is not only simplicity of Work, and also the absolute necessity as a need which I believe in, but that there are many, many subjects which are being touched upon, several ways of saying certain things or lighting up certain concepts on different sides or relating them to different, other—either experiences or again—different kind of concepts. As a result, the meetings have become quite filled and I do not expect you to understand all of it. I don't expect all of you to understand even all of it. I don't expect anyone—anyone in particular, to understand all of the meetings.

There is food for many. There is much more overfeeding, also for many, and I want to warn you about that, because there's no use taking certain things for granted because someone else has said so. At most, the way you can use it is that it gives you an impetus for a wish, and that you must rely on: your own verification after many years of Work. So that that what I'm saying comes from of course experience, and also as a result of many times having to explain certain things to different people over several years, and that one of the reasons of having meetings at the present time is a personal one. I want to put as much as I can on tape. I believe it might be worthwhile for later, but it does not mean that I expect you to take it all in.

Take only what comes right for you. Don't bother too much about the things that you do not as yet understand or that even seem paradoxical; because in Work as one goes along, because of the complexity of one's own experiences and the different way by which one approaches a certain subject coming from different places as it were, within oneself, one always will find paradoxes. It cannot be avoided because it is in the fact or it is the reason—is that when I come from one side to something, it looks like that what is shown to that side. If I come from the other side, it may look quite different and still it's the same thing. That is in the nature of Work. It's also in the nature of any acquisition of knowledge, and much what is on the tapes has to remain for a long time knowledge for you, until by verification, application in your life, experiences based on it—it becomes understanding for you, as part of you, part of your life, part of your Being. It is there, and I hope it will, as I said—that it will be useful.

I speak now of Group II and Group III: sometimes in a little different way. We have now a Group II in Boston, but it is only a reading group. So there is one in Berkeley and there is one in San Francisco. We don't have one here as yet. I don't think it's necessary as yet, but that means that that Group II will contain certain people who still want to know about Work and so particularly in Berkeley, because that happens to be a very strange place; and I don't want to have any kind of an open meeting—as it were—that the people who come to that Group II and listen, and then will want to know about Work, they

will form a so-called Group III. But that Group III is not an open group and it is a group only by invitation of people who come from Group II.

Now we have a similar situation here for the so-called Monday group. The Wednesday group, I consider a Group III because people who are new can come, not necessarily by invitation but by recommendation, and when they have heard about Gurdjieff and want to know a little more, it is then my particular task to talk to them in a certain way, trying to reach as many different types as I can by a variety of different kinds of explanations: In the first place, giving certain backgrounds in relation to life and the necessity for Work and the perfectly good reason of Work, and of course the perfectly good reason of talking about Gurdjieff as a man. But then there are certain people among those who would like to know: “What do I do now?” and it is kind of difficult for me to explain it, because there is not so much time, and I cannot cover that ground so well unless I interrupt a flow of thought which I believe is also logical and perhaps more penetrating. So for that reason I asked a few people to take care of that particular problem. And that is the problem that I feel has to be solved on Monday evening, so that Monday evening is not a group in the sense we mean it. It is really a communication of telling people how to Work—no more. That on Monday there will be people who come, because when I recommend there is a Monday evening, some of them will simply say, “Oh, we must attend that,” and then they lose track of the fact that it is really for Work; and if they are not

interested in Work, and even then, if they start asking questions on a Monday, they are a little out of place. At the same time when those who come, and they want to Work—it may not be that they as yet can Work, but they want to know how it ought to be done. Then, with that kind of information, they have to look around within their own mind and their own feeling to see if that kind of Work could be applied by them first in a little theory of understanding what must be done and then gradually an application in greatest simplicity in their ordinary life.

That there of course are questions which are not necessarily on the basis of wanting to know what is really Work, and that they do appear and my advice to Monday is: not to answer them, because I will take care of them. That's what the Wednesday is for, and I still have that as a Group. It may be necessary when one wants to find out where a question comes from, particularly when then the question is for the wish to Work, that one wants to find out a little bit more where the question comes from in them, so that then an answer can be linked with that; and then based on that kind of understanding and the establishment of confidence in the person who answers the question, that then of course whatever one then wants to communicate about Work will fall on a very good soil.

But I've also said that what is really important for that group is the Nucleus, the so-called "after-meeting," because that is where the five or six or however many people there are who are now answering questions—where they, as it were, will have to fight it out, because

the interest should be in exactitude, and language that is clear, logical, and to the point. And then when I hear or listen to the discussions, there is sometimes something missing which is not entirely right because it is not entirely Work. I do not mind if it is only a part leading up to Work because those who answer of course are limited in their own experience, and they must be truthful; so they cannot say what they don't know, really. That only perhaps, once in a while—give an indication, but they have to be truthful and it is very necessary sometimes to say, "In my life such and such happened and then I came in contact and then I didn't understand it for a long time and I had to think about it, and it looked to me a little too intellectual, or it looked to me too selfish or perhaps it was overdoing it a little bit in the direction of an emotional state or maybe it sounded a little bit too religious for me, and I am a practical man," etcetera, ecetera.

These are good statements and they may then strike home with someone where that kind of an answer is really best fitting for the kind of a question they may have asked. This is why I say that Work of that Nucleus is really extremely important, because on that I start to base the possibility of the continuation of Work. You understand what I have in mind. Since I will not live forever and since my interests have been in Work as a promise to Gurdjieff, that I feel the necessity of doing that as well as we can, and not to leave any loopholes so that the language, being correct, can then be accepted by everyone who also understands Work in the same way. So that

that what gradually will appear is like a grammar of how one describes Work.

And that there are many fights or disagreements—of course it is logical. It cannot be helped, because all of us come from different surroundings, and all of us have tried the application of Work in one's own life, and all of us have had different kind of experiences. But that's exactly what should be straightened out, so that more and more, one gets away from one's own experience into the principles of a simple application, and then the wording or the defining of that should be in such language that there is no maybe about it, and it really can be understood as a universal language of Work and not different kind of languages which would get mixed up like it happened at the Tower of Babel.

So that I feel it will take some time before these kind of things get straightened out and that in the meantime, one must not lose sight of the fact why that Group happened to exist because—and happens to exist—because it's not, as I said before, an ordinary group. It's a very special kind. And it's also a very special kind of trust I dare to put into it because I will be dependent very much on the assurance that things are understood, and that gradually I hope of course that such groups will increase and that there will be different kind of groups of that kind existing so that when I die, I can die in peace.

It brings up so often the question: what is this 'I' really? And I don't think we can talk enough about it because particularly since our concepts are so often strange; and since our intentions are not always

as intense; and since our honesty is not always on the same level; and since there are many different ways by which certain things can be said without violating principles; and because people in general do not always want to tell the truth—not even to each other. I think for many of such reasons the concept of 'I' is not understood. It is really not the question of an interpretation anymore, because one must talk about it.

Anyone who still believes that the continuation as the mind is now, or as one's—one's feeling is now, or even if one's feeling becomes emotion as an increase in depth, it's also possible to increase thoughts in depth because we have an instrument by which we start to compare the weight. You know, one starts to consider the importance of a thought particularly in ordinary life, also particularly when one sees how much there is lost, and energy just going down in the gutter, that after some time one wants to be quite precise and also train the mind not to waste too much energy. But anyone who still considers that in that kind of a direction of growth which is a growth of this Earth, horizontal and parallel to the Earth, maybe a little bit away from the surface than ordinary, average thought and average feeling, never-the-less constantly remaining bound to the Earth and belonging to Earth—even if the language is beautiful and poetical, and even if the feeling is expressed in forms of aesthetics.

Anyone who believes that Objectivity will be reached by means of that, is, in my opinion, fundamentally wrong; and I cannot say this enough because there is always the tendency that at a certain place

one will come to that what is Objective and Objectivity does not live on Earth. You can go to the ends of the world without finding it. The one direction for Objectivity is upwards. It is away from the Earth because that is the definition. Objectivity is not subjective, and the Earth as Mankind knows it is subjective also by definition. An Objective viewpoint of the earth can only be gotten when one gets away and looks down, so that the Earth can become a point.

So when one wants to talk about 'I', it is simply a means of indicating that there is something which at the present time does not exist, and it has to exist in order to give a person hope to be able to reach that level where 'I' would live in order to become free from the Earth. For that reason, it cannot even have a form, because I cannot define what is the form of Objectivity. I know different forms on Earth; I can distinguish between solids and liquid and gas. I have a certain knowledge of a body. I know also air; I say, "Impressions I know." They become subjective because I take them in with subjective organs. I know a little bit about magnetism, about electricity, about forces outside of me, forces perhaps existing in space. Philosophically, I try to explain a force. I really don't know how to explain it. I can say and talk about "force fields." I can talk about a point of force, but it has always to do with an activity which then in exerting such a force will move an object from one place to another. That for me is a force, and even then when I say "magnetic force," I explain it as an attraction.

To be able to understand what is meant by the level where ‘I’ must live and not even have the attributes of what we know of Earth and everything subjective is extremely difficult even to conceive of in a subjective mind. But unless I have a chance not only to think and to feel but to make—to make it possible as a concept, that it exists outside of all the realms of my subjectivity, I will not be able to give any credence to that what ought to exist as a help. I do it in my feeling, of course, when I say and talk about God because that for me is something that is entirely different from a human being. I give it an idea when I talk about Infinity, or about Life Eternal, or about the different things that I don’t understand and take them totally together, and I say that is the unknown, but unknown then has an existence. For the question of space when I don’t understand what is space, than only sometimes again I say philosophically, it must be because I know form. I know space exists without form, which of course is not so. Space exists, form exists within—within the space.

I must learn to understand what is meant by a crystallization of a force into matter. I must understand that matter becomes ethereal simply by taking the molecules a little bit more apart and that, although I go through a gaseous state sometimes in that what is now matter for me, that the extending of that kind of a process will lead to certain things that I can call ethereal. But all of that is not as yet what is Objectivity.

Objectivity is, of course, the ability to look at anything subjective from a standpoint which is not interested in the subjectivity of that

kind of an object. Otherwise I would soil the idea of Objectivity and it is logical that when I want to think about that what is then what makes Objectivity Objective, I have to introduce something that is entirely different from any form of subjectivity that I'm familiar with. So I become interested in what I'm familiar with, and I say I know my thoughts—they exist—and concepts of thoughts, and including in that even the ponderabilia—that is, that what I can ponder about. I know of feeling and depth. I know of that what is a concept that could relate to that what is higher than I am. But how much higher and where and is it a direct line to that what is higher when even my wish says I want to go somewhere. Is it necessary to break that line at a certain place where it leaves the atmosphere of the Earth and then enters into space and then must conceive of a crystallization which I call Objective, because it is exactly for that reason that I must introduce space, so that then, in space, all subjectivity must stop.

It's the same problem when I say form, and it's the same problem when I use time; and then when I dare to say that Objectivity is like a timelessness, or when I say Objectivity must be when there is no form, then I must substitute for such concepts certain terms, which for the time being, I cannot experience, but I know they must exist because I happen to think about it and I happen to feel about it.

That is how one comes to the question of a quantum—of a realization of something that is divided which can only be overbridged by something that goes from one place to the other. If I say that something comes from the Earth and it goes into space and it leaves

the atmosphere of the Earth; and when it is in space, it is on its own—what is there of this world which can actually go further than the Earth's atmosphere? It is not air. I know that, because that's the end of the atmosphere. It becomes finer and finer. Finally it disappears. Then the space has no air. It cannot be the thought because the thought also ends. I can send it out, but it is a subjective force which only can overbridge certain things in the subjective world, and can go to the ends of the world—but a thought cannot leave it.

In order to clarify that for oneself, I say my thought may not be able to do it, but if I use a force of my emotional state, then there will be a possibility that it will reach God, and that for a long time remains quite satisfactory, because I cannot prove it. The difficulty that exists, of course, is always that I want to have time become timeless, that I want to have a form become life, and that the attributes of life and that timelessness is Eternity. I've all kind of words to indicate what it would be if it would be spaceless, but that is a contradiction in terms, because in space there is nothing. It just happens to be. The reason I know that space is there is because of the crystallizations in space. That is how I am reminded, and now I have to overbridge a certain … distance of space, and the distance is measured by where I come from, up to the place where I'm going. The measurement is between two points of crystallizations. When I say that the Earth with the atmosphere is subjective, I want to say that the next crystallization is Objective, and that that what I have to cross over is space. For that I need something special to propel me, because the force which I have

on Earth runs out at the end of the atmosphere. I can say I can shoot something to the Moon, but that is a little particle of the Earth with all the different oxygens and so forth, in order to keep alive, because if I went without that projectile I would die. How can I stay alive in travelling through space? The only way is to equip myself in such a way that I would be able to live at the next crystallization. This is really the whole question of Work. I want to become from what I am now as Man a Being which I call Kesdjanian, which belongs to the next crystallization, which for me are the planets. It doesn't matter if the crystallization after that is the Sun, and that for that I wish to have a Soul, but what belongs to me is not the space. The space only gives me an indication of what is taking place in accordance with Universal Law. I have to apply it within the world which is my own. Otherwise, I will not get anywhere; because by itself it is impossible for me to go through space away from the Earth, but I can understand for myself the possibility to get away from my body. So then the concept remains the same in principle, but now I have to cross over from the accent on my body to the accent on my emotions, and for that I need something that I call now Objective, which in physics, would be called that what is a quantum. And the reason I need it is that on Earth, my feeling as potentiality for my emotions is linked up with my body, and that the only possibility of reaching an emotional state—free and independent—as if I have gone through space to reach it, can only be accomplished by the separation of that what is now a physical center from a so-called emotional or a feeling center.

I hope you understand this reasoning because it is really quite important to see that I cannot go from my body to my emotions, and have them separate—because they are already one. And this is where I make a mistake, because I believe that I am already without space. I believe that I am already united. I already believe that I am God. I already am so conceited that I tell God what to do. I fail completely when I just start to grow up, not after certain years of maturity, but when I start to grow up. I fail completely in knowing my place. This is Kundabuffer. This is what is put into me like a substance which produces a chemical very much like a tranquilizer, or any form of a drug, will give me certain hallucinations about myself. You might say this is a tranquilizer of a sort because it puts me more to sleep. This has been given and is continued by education, because those who give education are also drugged by the same drug of Kundabuffer. So there is no hope to be derived from them. The hope can only come from that what has not yet been soiled by subjectivity within oneself, and that is why I talk about life, and when it is Magnetic Center as the concentration of life in one point, that is the only concept that I can accept, which for me is still as it always has been and always will be, because then in considering myself, and having life and then having to —having to—accept the fact of life being eternal, that what is within me becomes eternal, and my belief then is based on the possibility of setting it free, and this concept of eternity within myself is contrary to that what I have been brought up with.

Because immediately when that starts to take hold in my mind as well as in my feelings, I have then a realization that Man is not at all what he thinks he is, and not at all what he has been told he is. And then the words of the Bible become clearer when man is told that he is a child of God. Then one starts in maturity to think about God: if He, as His Endlessness, exists for me. And the next question is, "Do I, in my smallness, exist for Him?" So now we have a question then, of different kind of relationships, and you might say also, different distances, and trying to see into the future. I wish then for me that the future to become present in such a way that that what I now know is potential I already see in its totality. This is the idea of timelessness, of that what we sometimes call telescoping time, sometimes what is explained in Manhood of Humanity as man being able to continue in his life where someone else—his father or mother or whatever—has left off, and it is the same as that what I at the present time project into the future, so that in the terminology of timelessness, future and present and past become one.

This process is a projection of that what is possible and the belief that it is now. If you take that as a concept and you reverse it, you start to understand what is meant by time, eating one—oneself up. Then you will understand why God and Heropass for His Endlessness is exactly that same process that I talk about when I project myself as a potentiality into the future. And now when you want to give those names you call that what is God and Heropass 'involution,' and you call your own projection into the future 'evolution.' And that both

must exist at the same time will then enable a Man on the Earth or anybody in the universe to crystallize out at a certain point. That you must understand: that that is inherent now in these two definitions and that there is nothing contradictory about it, because it's the same process looked at it from two different sides. One is looking at it from the totality of all things into which time comes as a concept as if eating up that what exists in reality representing that what is a force being dynamic, crystallizing out at certain points. The other is the realization of oneself in the limitations in which a Man lives, wishing then to grow in order to understand Eternity. Now the question of how to overbridge this space is indicated by what I consider for myself a feeling and an emotional state which I now wish to stand on its own feet. And for that I have to feed information into my emotional state which gives it the understanding that it can live by itself and as a lifetime which is longer than the physical body. It is as if one then wants to tell one's emotions that it is far more important to stand on its own instead of continuing to live with the physical body.

Side Two

And this of course becomes inherent in the concept of life being eternal and it is for that reason that an emotional state, that what is really depth, wishing to live life as long as it is possible, does not want to be connected any longer with the physical body which we know will die. It does not mean that the emotional body reaches Objectivity in the real sense, because Kesdjanian body, unfortunately, is a crystallization which is also subject to an eating up by time—time belonging to the Kesdjanian level. So that then the limitations of the

Kesdjan, although expressed in our time—that is, in our concept of our time belonging to Earth—is of a different kind—different kind of number, or a different kind of relationship towards that what is our time. Nevertheless, Kesdjan is also mortal.

For a man thinking about that, he has to consider very well what advantage there is of creating a Kesdjanian body; because if he considers his own death as a physical entity, and as something that is bound to come, when he considers then that death also coming to Kesdjan will only postpone that kind of an execution, he will lose interest because the question then as a problem is not fundamentally solved. So when one considers this as Kesdjan—that it cannot be the end to the thoughts of man when he wishes to consider Eternity, there has to be something that he feels will live forever and ever. For that concept, we simply use Soul. So that within the possibility of man as he can see, which is not further than the third when he is on point one —because the limitations of his eyes, the limitations of his brain, the limitations of his feelings are at the present time subject to the laws of Earth, and for that reason, a man cannot conceive of more than his Soul. But that Soul being three in relation to Body Kesdjan and then Soul has in itself, as the Law of Three, the potentiality of becoming one with the other two, and this gives a man in fact thinking, a satisfaction; because that establishes then, you might say, a certain rule, or even a Law, that if that is possible, he can then go on and on, without having any fear that he will die. That is inherent again in the changeover of the Law of Seven into the Law of Three, because that

what a man must believe in when he sees that what is crystallized is that what is outside of the crystallizations, and not belonging to it, and simply considering the noumenal world as occupying space.

If one once understands that this as a Law of Three becomes an eternal Law, then it remains in existence wherever the current of evolution would take him. That then he knows that in the last instance, if that is the instance of Eternity, out of his own Law of three components, a oneness can be made, if it were necessary to change dynamics into a static condition. This is the problem that man never will solve and it is not solvable—solvable in life, and it is not to be solved with life. It is even not solved in infinity, because in infinity that kind of a problem does not occur anymore. It is at the point where a Man, if he still is a Man—if he as Conscious Being has gone through his own solar system of the three bodies, and become one, and 'I'—as I've explained once in awhile—has gone through the "eye of a needle" into a certain field or a sphere which belongs to a cosmic intelligence, in which then that what is outside of the number three becomes perceptive—perceptible to a Man—again I say as man--that's all we know; continuing as a form in which there is Life of such a Man, that he can reach after this second octave has been fulfilled of a cosmic intelligence—reach a third. Again being bound by the Law of Three in which this dynamic process must take place and that then in the third octave at the end of that as a 'Si-Do,' he faces the possibility of the Tri-unity of the Sun Absolute.

All this of course sounds extremely philosophical, and perhaps theoretical; but I doubt it because this kind of concept which pervades everything existing belongs exactly to that what is indicated as the necessity that when one wants to leave subjectivity, the introduction of something new must take place, because that what is not subjective, is of a higher level away from the Earth. The quantum in this case is the concept of Objectivity. Such a concept is not known on this Earth. Such a concept is defined in the beginning as that what is opposite to everything existing. When everything existing includes the thoughts and the feelings, Objectivity must be contra to that. Objectivity for a Man who exists on the Earth is non-existence. He will find out that that what is Objectivity as the first step—perhaps indicated by Kesdjan—the second step indicated by Soul, is the beginning of a staircase; but he also knows that the staircase, being subject to the Law of Three, will have an end. And what this end will be, man is not interested in now, because he has to first, at first he has to find the first step.

That is why it is so silly to talk about the continuation of one's thought or the hope that if you just continue to feel well or that you come within yourself that you have emotional states belonging to the Earth, that if you are just quiet, if you just meditate, that a point will be reached without defining even that point. It will not be reached. It only will be reached in principle by the introduction of something out of this world, which we call for us now Objectivity. As an Objective faculty—an 'I'—and that this 'I' becomes the savior for a mMan on

Earth to reach a higher level of Being: as first stepping stone, Emotional Life, as second stepping stone, Intellectual Life, and when one in Work or in the description of a method, does not mention that fact, all considerations, lovely as they may be, are not right and will not enable any man to reach Heaven. He has to be convinced that something has to be created; because if it is not created, it will not have any further effect on him. And his thought, being limited, cannot, and the feeling, being limited, cannot, even if it is an emotion. Something has to pull a man out of the state in which he is, because he is bound; and that something has to be above and free from him, but benevolent towards him.

So the process has to be explained that that what I wish to create as 'I', first in my thoughts which of course are—that is, legitimate, because I can have even hallucinations and that I in my imagination can see that certain things could exist; then I wish them to exist, but the reality of the existence will only come when that what is a concept is applied in my life, because then that will become for me reality so that 'I' becomes a reality for me on Earth. When I say that that what I was wished to put into that as a concept without determining what is the form, I say it's my life, because *that* I wish to continue with. That gives for a Man the possibility of an understanding of what is Work, as a concept to be applied. That will give to 'I' the possibility of becoming acquainted with me in an absolute sense.

So far this is my Work only. It is based fundamentally on the wish, the creation of 'I' as a mental function. Sometimes it's based on that

what I understand already in my mind to some extent being alive to the possibility of God being present to me; so that for certain people there is the realization of an entity which is emotional and I call God or the grace of the Lord being present to me, but functioning exactly the same as 'I' must function—that is, out of this world. So that then, when I call this 'I' and I say this is a little bit intellectual in description, because it comes from me, I have given it my wish. But I also want this 'I' to represent the possibility of reaching God, and I hope that that what I have created is right in the eyes of God. I've said before that when 'I' is created with that from me, I wait because I want to find out if God approves. I want from God something in the form of life, recognizing my life in my 'I' so that He will look benevolently on that creation of mine, and this will give to the 'I' the possibility of having an emotional quality which will afterwards grow out into a Kesdjanian body. The two belong together, because the emotion is fully as important as an intellect for the purposes of Work.

Don't make a mistake about that. Work is not limited to a description of ABC. Work means the creation of that what could become a unit for me. Since I know the conflict between my mind and my feeling, I want to create something that is unified in the wish and the thought—if I call it that way—perhaps perception. So that because of that, there is a reality for me as a man to be guided by 'I' in that what I have to do. The sole reason for wanting God to be there is that 'I' am there and the sole reason for me to be there is because God is there. Work is the bridge for man towards God, between that

what is Earth and Heaven, so that man need not any longer be in between—that is, that he has for himself the realization that after whatever time length and whatever no time length is demanded to work out this particular karma where he finds himself with when he is on Earth, that then he has real hope in the fulfillment of fusion with His Endlessness. This is the sole reason that a Man, when he is in between the two worlds, must take cognizance of each world: that that what he wishes is to be in between his Consciousness and Conscience, because then Man executes as Will what is required for the conditions in which he happens to live.

This is the reason that a Man walking on a railroad track, walking in between the rails—rails, goes towards Infinity because that he sees parallel lines, he says to his ordinary mind: they meet in Infinity. He takes that because he happens to see how they seem to converge. You might say, “It’s an image,” or “It is perhaps a mistake on the part of his eyes,” but it is enough for him to have belief. This is like the creation of ‘I’. You understand that, because if I wish an ‘I’ to be and to be functioning, I see the unity. I know it isn’t there if I intellectually consider it, and I know if I say “feeling” and it isn’t there yet, but I—being affected by both—I see in the distance the parallel lines meet. That becomes for me reality. Then I walk and walking is Work. Walking is the application of giving ‘I’ then a function and then making ‘I’ Work for me. I give ‘I’ a task and, because of that, receiving information about me, which as subjective being is my reality, ‘I’ becomes real, like the lines of the two rails in the future

meet. My belief in that carries me through the difficulty of not understanding how imagination can become reality.

I say these things because in talking about Work, never forget the necessity of that kind of emphasis of 'I'. It's the only way by which Gurdjieff can be understood. It's the only way by which that what is the "Only Way" can be understood. It's the only way by which you can read All and Everything. It's the one thing that practically was forgotten by Ouspensky: never emphasizing enough, perhaps only once or twice a little bit, never in all the mathematical dealings and all the later chapters, as it were forgetting and perhaps not remembering.

If you wish to be a good student of All and Everything, you must learn to explain to yourself what the meaning is of 'I' for you, as an independent something created by you and related to you by two things. One is that 'I' exists as a result of my wish and a result of my wish to create. The other is the benevolence of 'I' as a result of God giving it life regarding me to give me facts about myself. Why facts about myself? Why absolute facts? You see, the question every once in a while is asked, but what else do I want? Can I stand on that what is sand, and let it be washed away? What's the idea of rock? Solidity. When I strive for that what I wish, I don't want relativity. When I say I wish permanency, I don't settle for anything that is temporary.

I want of course Absoluteness, because that is the Truth and there is no other Truth. And why do I want Truth? To build, to have a foundation which is not shifting, because I'm going to evolve. I'm not

going to stay on Earth forever and ever. I never will anyhow, but I want to get away. I want to have a guide who knows the Truth. I don't wish any detour. I don't want to live a couple of lives at a certain place if I could have been informed already beforehand which road I should have taken. When once I understand that there is knowledge available, I will go after such knowledge in order to become free because I know my life hates this Earth. It can get along with it, but what is the use staying here, and repeating and repeating, because there is a limitation to the Earth. There is a limitation to my body, and I don't help it by flying to the Moon.

My world has to be investigated: adventure, that what I believe is the future—that I would conceive of as future—should be for me constantly new, in order to give me renewed hope. It should be reachable. I have to believe that the hope when it is truthful will turn into truth, that my love for life will turn into life itself, that my faith must be the belief which belongs to His Endlessness. Otherwise I will not be able to continue, but I'm perfectly willing, when that is established, to be patient. This is really the big thing in life, because if I just wait and wait, I've said before, for a streetcar which never comes, I will kill myself. Because I'd much rather take that positive act instead of waiting for the end as given to me. It's exactly because I'm a Man. But when I'm a Man and I don't want to take my life, then I have to have in my life an assurance, and that is God. I can say, for the time being, I will take certain things in the image of God. When I say I know I need this and I need that, and there is a possibility of

supplying it, I will wait until supplied. I will not wait forever, because my mind and my feeling will not allow me. They will want to go in directions where there is more hope, because they still are on Earth, alive, and they have to fulfill their own tasks because they are concerned with Man as he is on Earth, and that what is Man on Earth has a requirement for a Man to become ultimately Harmonious, so that then the three bodies are together. A Man does not want to neglect any one of his centers, even if he knows that some of them are not as yet full grown. He will pay attention to it but he pays attention to his physical body as well. This is what gives him hope that ultimately there will be a unity between the three.

Patience also runs out. Patience is not becoming to a Man when he keeps on being patient. A Man at a certain time says, “Enough of this nonsense.” Then he goes. This is the way a person decides when he wishes to Work. He has to come to a place where he says, “Enough of this unconscious living. Enough of this rigamarole of my life on Earth. Enough of all the prattle and the nonsense that I hear. I’ve had enough—I’m fed up.”

You see, it is difficult to come to that point, because you’re so attached, because you want to hold on, because you say, “You never can tell.” That’s why one has patience. Because you never can tell, and then you say, “A miracle!” What kind? A miracle of this Earth, or a miracle as given from Heaven? A miracle must be. The miracle is Work. The miracle is that the road is opened as the only way for those who have eyes to see and ears to hear. The miracle is for those who

are finished with their “patience,” that they have become impatient, that they wish to go like a horse, ready for a race, chafing at his bit. That is why I talk many times about the aliveness of a Man, because when he remains alive, he must come to that conclusion; because his aliveness will bring him to all kind of walls, to a realization of all kind of prisons, to that what he knows, in the end, is not for him. You can call that wildness of a horse, but then he has to be tamed to be able to go through the eye of a needle. He has to team up with Consciousness. He has to team up with the driver of the carriage. He has to belong to the carriage with a harness, but free to move the carriage upon the command of Consciousness. It is all right to be a horse, but not by itself, and not remaining wild. The tamer of a horse, if he is a Man, will not have patience and wait until the horse says, “Yes.” A Man says, “Yes.” His body says, “No.” His feeling says, “I agree.”

These things, I’m sure, will come up every once in a while—questions about your ‘I’. How to make it. How to believe in it; how not to be ashamed of saying it, even if it sounds strange to anyone. God and the name of God sounds just as strange as ‘I’. If you want to say, “I create my God,” I have no fault to find with that, provided you give that God attributes of ‘I’: the attributes of non-thinking, the attribute of not-feeling, just an attribute of being alive, and in functioning, becoming Aware. When ‘I’ functions, it is Aware. When ‘I’ is, it is alive. When ‘I’ remains alive and Aware, ‘I’ is Awake.

So, no questions tonight. I give you all a task: that you now when you are by yourself, you try to review this whole meeting from beginning to end, to see if you can remember the logical sequence of the thoughts from a very small beginning until a concept which is so all encompassing that it makes your head swim: to go from a very small beginning to the universal truth of Eternity. If you can, in your own words, think or repeat or write a little, or if you wish, at such a time, to meditate about the sequence of an evolution, of the placing of involution, of that what belongs to Heropass, which gives an example of that what we should not do as against that what is evolution, which is eating Time—that then you will for yourself be able to apply Work in your life, and that of course is what I hope you will be able to do.

Good night.

END TAPE